

## REMARKS

After entry of this response, Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 17-19, 21, 22, 25-33, and 36-41 remain pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration by the Examiner in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 19, 21, 22, 27-29, 31-33, and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kreyenhagen et al. (US 5,152,298, hereinafter "Kreyenhagen"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Kreyenhagen reference fails to disclose a C-shaped interference clamp as stated for example, in amended Claim 1. Kreyenhagen discloses a suture sleeve that has three sections including a mid section that has an outer threaded surface 24 and a third section having an inner threaded surface 38. See col. 2, lines 31-55. In the open configuration, i.e., with the threaded portions being disengaged, a lead body can freely move within the suture sleeve. The Kreyenhagen reference discloses that the lead in order for the lead to be gripped, the threaded surfaces on the mid section and third section are engaged resulting in compression of a portion 29 within the tubular member that consequently grips the lead. See col. 3, lines 14-25. The C-shaped interference clamp of Claim 1, for example, expands upon insertion of a lead thereby gripping the lead. Moreover, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, engagement of the threaded surfaces precludes the rotational coupling between the mid section and the third section. In other words, gripping the lead body and relative rotational movement between the parts are mutually exclusive features of the teachings of the Kreyenhagen reference. In Claim 1, for example, relative rotational movement between the proximal and distal portions is maintained even while the C-shaped interference clamp engages the lead. The C-shaped engagement mechanism thereby permits the lead body to be maneuvered to enable affixation of the lead through rotation of the tool of Claim 1, for example.

Furthermore, in Claim 1, for example, the rotation indicator indicates relative rotation between the proximal and distal portions while the lead connector assembly is engaged by the C-shaped interference clamp. As mentioned above, engaging the mid section to the third section causes the tool of the Kreyenhagen reference to rotate as a

single unit thereby precluding the indication of rotation between the parts. The indication of relative rotation between the distal and proximal portions of the present application, facilitates lead fixation by enabling the implanting physician to determine the number of rotations of the conductor within the lead body without rotating the lead body itself.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 19, 21, 22, 27-29, 31-33, and 40-41 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kreyenhagen.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 17-19, 21, 22, 27-33, and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Starkey et al. (US 5,137,288, hereinafter "Starkey"). In the alternative the pending claims stand rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Huff et al. (US 5,330, 204, "Huff"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Starkey discloses a wire gripping handle that is taught as having two tubular members 12, 14 each having a longitudinal slot 20, 30 (respectively) extending through the wall. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that the slot 20 (and 30) is equivalent to the C-shaped interference clamp of amended Claim 1. To the extent that the tubular members 12, 14 are a C-shaped interference clamp, the Starkey reference is deficient of a teaching of a proximal and distal portion as stated, for example, in claim 1. In contrast to the present application, Starkey merely discloses that the tubular members simply have slots 20, 30 formed on the walls. The Examiner asserts that the "collar engagement portion 20 is C-shaped." Respectfully, the subject matter of cancelled Claim 12, now incorporated in Claim 1, recites a C-shaped interference clamp and the Starkey reference fails to teach or suggest this element. Moreover, to the extent that the Examiner considers the collar engagement portion 20 is C-shaped, Applicant respectfully asserts that the reference, taken as a whole, teaches that the entire wire gripping handle is likewise a C-shaped interference clamp and the reference fails to teach each element of Claim 1. This is because the tubular members are similarly formed with slots on the walls. Moreover, for the same or similar reasons stated with respect to the Kreyenhagen reference, Starkey fails to remedy the deficiency of maintaining relative rotational movement between the proximal and distal portions

while the C-shaped interference clamp engages the lead. Additionally, there is simply no teaching of a rotation indicator that indicates relative rotation between the proximal and distal portions.

The Huff reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of the Starkey reference and accordingly fails for the same or similar reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims as being anticipated by Starkey or in the alternative by Huff.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2008

/Daniel G. Chapik/  
Daniel G. Chapik  
Reg. 43,424  
Telephone: (763) 526-0940  
Customer No. 27581